

quite different from Watamoto which does not display a message indicating excess demand nor stores time markers associated with a powering up event.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 10 – 13, 16, 17, 18 and 30 were objected to by the examiner as lacking antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claims 8 and 9 to provide antecedent basis for the plurality of powered devices of claim 10, and the identifiers of claims 17 – 18. Claim 28 has been amended to provide antecedent basis for the plurality of attached powered devices of claim 30.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2 and 4 - 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by LeCreff (U.S. Patent Application Publication S/N 2003/0072438). Independent claim 1 has been amended to positively recite that the supplied power is sufficient to fully power the attached powered device. Contrastingly, LeCreff does not power the device. In particular switch 29 of LeCreff is not closed, since the signal voltage must be low enough "not to be mix up by the detector 28 as a remote powering".

Claim 1 is thus deemed patentable over LeCreff. Claims 2 and 4 - 7 are also deemed patentable at least for being dependent there from.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 3, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeCreff (U.S. Patent Application Publication S/N 2003/0072438). Independent claim 1 has been amended, as described above, to positively recite that the supplied power is sufficient to fully power the attached powered device and is thus deemed patentable over LeCreff. Claims 3, 14 and 15 are thus deemed patentable at least for depending on patentable claim 1.

Claims 8 – 13, 16, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeCreff in view of Lehr (U.S. Patent 6,473,608). Independent claim 1 has been amended, as described above, to positively recite that the supplied power is sufficient to fully power the attached powered device and is thus deemed patentable over LeCreff. Lehr neither teaches nor suggests fully powering a detected attached powered device for a time interval. Lehr is directed to powering devices, and in the event of excess power consumption, disconnecting power while maintaining priority. Lehr neither teaches nor suggests powering for a predetermined time interval. Contrarily, power management of Lehr, as described in Figs. 19A – 20D, and the associated descriptions, is particularly aimed at *preventing a situation* of temporarily powering a detected device due to a lack of power. No combination of Lehr and LeCreff can teach what neither Lehr or LeCreff teach or suggest. Claims 8 – 13, 16, 17, 18 are thus deemed patentable at least for dependent on patentable claim 1.

Additionally, amended claim 10 recites that the supplied power is sufficient to power the device, which as explained above is patentably distinguished from both LeCreff and Lehr. Furthermore, neither LeCreff nor Lehr alternately supply power to each of the unpowered devices. LeCreff signals the attached device singularly upon connection and detection. Lehr does not teach powering for a limited time period, and does not teach alternately supplying power for a time interval. The combination of LeCreff and Lehr can not teach what neither of them teaches.

Additionally, claim 17 recites a time interval of powering which is a function of the number of identifiers in the queue and claim 18 recites a time interval which is a function of the sum of the of power requirements of the powered devices in the queue. Adjusting the amount of time to be powered is neither taught nor suggested by Lehr or by LeCreff. Lehr places unpowered nodes in a queue, however Lehr does not power nodes for a time interval which is a function of the number of nodes in the queue. Lehr simply places them in a queue awaiting additional power, and thus the time interval of powering is not a function of the identifiers of the queue. LeCreff does not teach a queue and does not power for a limited time interval. The combination of LeCreff and Lehr can not teach what neither of them teaches.

Claims 21 – 27, 34, 35 and 40 –43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeCreff in view of Watamoto (U.S. Patent 6,392,695).

Independent claim 21 has been amended, as described above, to positively recite that the supplied power is sufficient to fully power the attached powered device and is thus deemed patentable over the combination of LeCreff and Watamoto. Neither LeCreff nor Watamoto teach supplying operating power for a predetermined interval because of excess demand. The combination of LeCreff and Watamoto can not teach what neither of them teaches.

Claims 22 – 27, 34 and 35 are thus deemed patentable at least for depending on patentable claim 21.

Independent claim 40 has been amended, as described above, to positively recite that the stored time marker is associated with a powering up event and is thus deemed patentable over the combination of LeCreff and Watamoto. Neither LeCreff nor Watamoto teach comparing a current time marker with a stored time marker associated with a powering up event. The combination of LeCreff and Watamoto can not teach what neither of them alone teaches.

Claims 41 and 42 are thus deemed patentable at least for depending on patentable claim 40.

Independent claim 43 has been amended, as described above, to positively recite that the previously stored time marker is associated with a powering up event and is thus deemed patentable over the combination of LeCreff and Watamoto. Neither LeCreff nor Watamoto teach comparing a current time marker with a previously stored time marker associated with a powering up event. The combination of LeCreff and Watamoto can not teach what neither of them alone teaches.

Claims 28 – 33, 36, 37 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeCreff in view of Watamoto and Lehr.

Independent claim 21, upon which claims 28 – 33 and 36 – 38 ultimately depend has been amended as described above, to positively recite that the supplied power is sufficient to fully power the attached powered device and is thus deemed patentable over the combination

of LeCreff, Watamoto and Lehr. Claims 28 – 33 and 36 – 38 are thus deemed patentable at least for depending on patentable claim 21.

Additionally, claim 30 is patentable over the combination of LeCreff, Watamoto and Lehr as none of them teach or suggest alternatingly powering each of the attached powered devices. LeCreff does not supply a queue, and when requested to power a device, simply sets an alarm condition. It does not teach, nor suggest reviewing a queue of unpowered devices, and alternatingly alarming in each turn. LeCreff suggests that as devices are identified, an alarm is set for that device, which may be for a limited time. Furthermore, neither LeCreff nor Lehr alternatingly supply power to each of the unpowered devices. LeCreff signals the attached device singularly upon connection and detection. Lehr does not teach powering for a limited time period, and does not teach alternatingly supplying power for a time interval. Watamoto does on alternatingly power attached powered device. Watamoto simply displays a message prior to shut down. The combination of LeCreff, Lehr and Watamoto can not teach what none of them teaches.

Additionally, claim 37 recites a time interval of powering which is a function of the number of identifiers in the queue and claim 38 recites a time interval which is a function of the sum of the of power requirements of the powered devices in the queue. Adjusting the amount of time to be powered is neither taught nor suggested by Lehr, LeCreff or Watamoto. Lehr places upowered nodes in a queue, however Lehr does not power nodes for a time interval which is a function of the number of nodes in the queue. Lehr simply places them in a queue awaiting additional power, and thus the time interval of powering is not a function of the identifiers of the queue. LeCreff does not teach a queue and does not power for a limited time interval. Watamoto neither supplies a queue, nor a sets a time interval dependent on identifiers or classes of the queue. The combination of LeCreff, Lehr and Watamoto can not teach what none of them teaches.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all pending claims (i.e., Claims 1 - 44) is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned agent by telephone if it would in any way aid in the advancement of this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 12, 2007

/Simon Kahn/
Simon Mark Kahn
Reg. No. 48,249
Director of Intellectual Property
PowerDsine, Ltd.

Tel: 1-703-486-1150
Fax: 1-703-892-4510